

Rollins College Rollins Scholarship Online

Professional Standards Committee Minutes

College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports

9-26-2006

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 26, 2006

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 26, 2006" (2006). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 99.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/99

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Professional Standards Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

**Approved Minutes for PSC meeting September 26, 2006
(Recorded by W. Brandon and M. D'Amato and summarized by Wendy Brandon)**

Present: Wendy Brandon, Don Griffin, Mario D'Amato, Maria Ruiz, Steve Phelan, Gloria Cook, Deb Wellman, and guest Don Davison

Summary: Don Davison presented his view of the issues to be considered by Task Force #2. He wanted a clear direction from PSC before beginning conversation with others. We discussed validity and reliability issues with CIE. Important topics were how to bring about consistent implementation, what response rate was acceptable and how to get a better response rate, and which evaluations should be in the data set and which should not. All PE, IT, and courses with 2 or fewer students were removed from data set by Don and Paul and analyzed again. Although Don said the response rates and SD were close no matter what courses were included. But he admitted that the shape of the distribution might change if a higher percentage of students completed the CIE. Don D. said he understood that his group should do everything possible to ensure that CIE data was reliable, and he said it would be important to describe potential problems with data and for his group to recommend how to address these problems. Don said his group could focus on getting the proper data to make recommendation of how implementation could be addressed and what policy could be adopted to make implementation of CIE reliable. Don intends to view the work of Task Force #2 as a fact finding endeavor. Different strategies can be explored that move us to good and reliable because if we get hung up on perfect CIE, we will be wasting our energy.

We were interested in how the students completed the CIE and when they did the CIE. A member noted that it takes them a while to do them. No way to know, it was determined, if students did these evaluations all at one setting or one by one. Deb would try to find out the time spent on completing an evaluation. One member said we should see CIE as a work in progress. There was no reason, in her opinion that most of the problems could be addressed and the process improved. Don Davison felt the best way to control bias was to ensure everyone does the CIE in the same way.

How the CIE should be used was a really big concern. Several members noted the junior faculty had negative feelings regarding the CIE. We felt there should be serious discussion of all these problems when we report to the Faculty in December. We also discussed that if we keep CIE we should be under the assumption that it has been implemented consistently and reliable. How they are used is a separate issue and not a Task Force #2 concern. We made a motion and unanimously agreed for Task Force #2 to concern itself with getting proper data that will help with implementing CIE as reliably as possible. (Don Davison will head this committee and have as members—Mario, John Houston, Deb, Wendy and possibly Martha Cheng).

The discussion then concentrated how we might steer the evaluation system during this interim period. Steve Phelan mentioned his experience with CIE. He suggested that a set of questions might be read differently depending on the

content of the course (example: asking if course improved your critical thinking may not make sense if course was focused on increasing student use of imagination and creative thinking). And what if students were in charge of course and their own learning—how did CIE relate to a different kind of course design? Might these CIE questions be more appropriate for social sciences or sciences than humanities or fine arts, he asked. Steve suggested we ask ourselves what we are really learning from CIE about our teaching. Did we think student comments might go beyond the bounds of the CIE questions, that they were using a different language when writing their narratives? Also—what did we think about the number of hours students said they spent on course when it seemed to faculty member low for the amount of work assigned. Other members suggested we might need to query faculty about some of these issues when we can figure out how to manage the feedback we might get. Don Griffin suggested that we find out how faculty encouraged students to do CIE and if faculty found the CIE questions and student responses useful enough to modify their course. Maria suggested that we be careful doing this and think about what to ask so we get comments that are more general.

After Don Davison left, PSC looked at proposed by-law change submitted to PSC by Chair of FEC, Bob Moore. We did not oppose the change and asked Mario to rewrite it for clarity and send it around before Wendy took it to Executive Committee for interpretation.

Meeting was adjourned. Next meeting is Tuesday, October 17 at 12:30.